

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-13 are pending in this application. Claims 1-13 stand rejected. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 7, and 9 have been amended. The amendments made to the claims do not alter the scope of these claims, nor have these amendments been made to define over the prior art. Rather, the amendments to the claims have been made to improve the form thereof. In light of the amendments and remarks set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the pending claims is in immediate condition for allowance.

Claims 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants have amended claim 9 in light of the Examiner's comments. As such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication 2003/0212686 ("Chu-Carroll") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,684,088 ("Halahmi"). Applicants traverse this rejection.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify a reference or combine references to arrive at the claimed subject matter. The prior art references must also teach or suggest all the limitations of the claim in question. See, M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j). A reference can only be used for what it clearly discloses or suggests. See, In re Hummer, 113 U.S.P.Q. 66 (C.C.P.A. 1957); In re Stencil, 4 U.S.P.Q.2d 1071, 1073 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Here, the references, whether taken individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the invention claimed by the Applicants.

Among the limitations of independent claim 1 not present in the cited combination is a content obtainer for obtaining content data from a desired content server via a network in an unknown information description language.

According to the present specification, a communication terminal such as a cellular telephone requests content from a network. The content is delivered utilizing a mark-up language such as HTML or WML. However, when the cellular telephone requests this information, it does not know whether the information will be received as HTML or WML content. As such, the cellular telephone utilizes a discriminator to determine whether the information is HTML or WML and, once this is determined, the content is sent to an appropriate parser for parsing. The content is then displayed on a display section.

In contrast, in Chu-Carroll, the incoming message is in a known-information description language (i.e., an XML document) wherein the document is of some unknown type. The system in Chu-Carroll examines the document to find a document type and uses this document type to locate the parser extension associated with the document type.

However, this is unlike Applicants' explicitly claimed system. In Chu-Carroll, the incoming message is of a known type. Therefore, only the document extension needs to be analyzed to determine how the document is to be parsed. In contrast, according to Applicants' explicitly recited claimed invention, both the information description language and the document type are unknown. As such, there is a two-step analysis as recited by Applicants as opposed to the single document type determination required under Chu-Carroll.

The inclusion of Halahmi fails to cure the deficiency noted above. In Halahmi, a system and method for transmitting E-mails to a low band-width device is disclosed.

Halahmi merely discloses that decoded data can be converted to WML, TIFF, or other graphical file form that can be converted using OCR to form a WML message. However, there is no disclosure in Halahmi that content in an unknown information description language is analyzed by a content type discriminator for discriminating content type. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-6 are allowable over the cited reference.

Among the limitations of claim 7 not present in the cited combination is discriminating a content type of the obtained content data from a plurality of predetermined content types. Applicants note that the Office Action cites to Chu-Carroll particularly, page 3, paragraph 48, page 4, paragraphs 66-67, and claim 3. However, none of these paragraphs disclose Applicants' discriminating a content type of the obtained data from a plurality of predetermined content types.

Paragraph 48 refers to an application core which dynamically registers extension components. The extension components provide the services needed by a particular implantation. Further, paragraphs 66-67 disclose a known XML document being received, however, the document is of an unknown type. In this situation, all that is required is a parser capable of reading the appropriate document type in the received XML document.

In contrast, Applicants disclose receiving a document in unknown information description language. Thus, it is not only the document type that needs to be determined but the information description language as well. As such, Chu-Carroll fails to disclose this portion of Applicants' explicitly recited method. As such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 8-11 depend from, and contain all the limitations of claim 7. These dependent claims also recite additional limitations which, in combination with the

limitations of claim 7, are neither disclosed nor suggested by Chu-Carroll and are also believed to be directed towards the patentable subject matter. Thus, claims 8-11 should also be allowed.

Applicant has responded to all of the rejections and objections recited in the Office Action. Reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance for all of the pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

If the Examiner believes an interview would be of assistance, the Examiner is welcome to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Dated: June 16, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By  
Ian R. Blum

Registration No.: 42,336  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY  
LLP  
1177 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036-2714  
(212) 835-1400  
Attorney for Applicants

IRB/mgs